arXiv:hep-th/9711062v1 10 Nov 1997

Massless Wess–Zumino model as first quantized Siegel superparticle

A.A. Deriglazov[*], A.V. Galajinsky[†]
Physics Department, Tomsk State University,
634050 Tomsk, Russia,

and
D.M. Gitman[‡]
Instituto de Fisica, Universidade de São Paulo,
P.O. Box 66318, 05315-970, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

Abstract

It is shown that canonical quantization of the $4d$ Siegel superparticle yields massless Wess–Zumino model as an effective field theory. Quantum states of the superparticle are realized in terms of the real scalar superfields which prove to be decomposed into the sum of on-shell chiral and antichiral superfields.

PACS codes: 04.60.Ds, 11.30.Pb
Key words: canonical quantization, superparticle.

1. Already for a long time there exists permanent interest in the study and quantization of different classical and pseudoclassical models of relativistic particles. In fact, such an activity began with the works [1,2] where a pseudoclassical model (PM) for the Dirac particle in four dimensions was constructed, studied, and quantized. It was interesting to see how quantum mechanics of a spinning particle, which may also be treated as a free spinor field theory, can be reconstructed in the course of first quantization of Grassmann classical mechanics (pseudoclassical mechanics). It was expected that such an experience might be useful in the intensively developed that time string theory, where first quantization was and remains until now the main approach to quantum description. However, it soon became clear

---

[*] deriglaz@phys.tsu.tomsk.su

[†] galajin@phys.tsu.tomsk.su

[‡] gitman@fma.if.usp.br

that a PM is of independent theoretical interest and the natural questions appeared: Is it possible to treat any field theory (at least, a free field theory) as the result of first quantization of a classical particle model or a PM? Does there exist a regular method to construct such a model for a given field theory? Although these questions were not answered in general, many interesting results were obtained in that direction. For example, there were constructed PM for higher spin field theories in 3+1 and 2+1 dimensions [3, 4]. In particular, a PM which corresponds to the topologically massive gauge theory of spin-one particles (2+1 electrodynamics with Chern-Simons term) and a PM for the Weyl particle in an arbitrary even dimension have been presented [5, 6].

It has long been realized that the path integral representation for the propagator of a field theory may serve as a heuristic method to find an action of the corresponding PM. The effectiveness of such an approach was demonstrated for the scalar and spinor particles in four dimensions [2, 7, 8] and then used [9] to construct a new minimal PM for spinning particles in odd dimensions. However, the approach mentioned can not be considered as the universal one since the construction of a path integral itself may present a nontrivial tack. As an example one can mention the situation with the Weyl particle in even dimensions for which a PM was constructed but the corresponding path integral was not yet. Generally, a path integral representation for a field propagator keep no track of all the constraints of the corresponding particle model. In other words, a particle action enters into the path integral in the gauge fixed form.

It is natural to expect that a PM of a superparticle has to reproduce in the course of first quantization some supersymmetric field theory. However, its covariant quantization creates new (in comparison to those of spinning particles) difficulties related to the complicated constraints structure. Of prime interest (for motivations and a comprehensive list of references see Ref. 10) seems to be the Brink–Schwarz superparticle [11] which involves an infinitive ghost tower when BRST quantized [12]. The puzzle of covariant quantization of the superparticle can be addressed in two respects [10] (for an alternative twistor-harmonic approach see Ref. 13): The problem of quantizing the infinitely reducible second class constraints; The problem of quantizing the infinitely reducible first class ones. It is the Siegel superparticle [14] (later referred to as AB superparticle [15]) which allows one to examine the latter in an independent way.[1]

---

[1] In Ref. 16 further modifications (ABC-, $ABCD$-superparticles) have been proposed and shown [17]

Recently, a recipe how to supplement infinitely reducible first class constraints up to a constraint system of finite stage of reducibility has been proposed [19]. Before trying it within the framework of BFV quantization, it seems natural to consider canonical quantization of the model.

In the present letter we examine the problem in $R^{4/4}$ superspace and show that an effective field theory which corresponds to the first quantized Siegel superparticle is the massless Wess–Zumino model [20] in the component form.

2. The action functional which describes the dynamics of the Siegel superparticle in $R^{4/4}$ superspace reads [21] (we use the spinor notation from Ref. 22)

$$S=\int d\tau\{\frac{1}{2e}\Pi^m\Pi_m+i\dot{\theta}\rho-i\bar{\rho}\dot{\bar{\theta}}\}, \tag{1}$$

with

$$\Pi^m=\dot{x}^m-i\theta\sigma^m\dot{\bar{\theta}}+i\dot{\theta}\sigma^m\bar{\theta}+i\psi\sigma^m\bar{\rho}-i\rho\sigma^m\bar{\psi}.$$

It is invariant under global supersymmetry transformations,

$$\delta\theta=\epsilon, \qquad \delta\bar{\theta}=\bar{\epsilon}, \qquad \delta x^n=i\epsilon\sigma^n\bar{\theta}-i\theta\sigma^n\bar{\epsilon}, \tag{2}$$

as well as under local α- and κ-symmetries,

$$\begin{array}{lll} \delta_\alpha\theta=\alpha\dot{\theta}, & \delta_\alpha\bar{\theta}=\alpha\dot{\bar{\theta}}, & \delta_\alpha x^n=\alpha\dot{x}^n, \\ \delta_\alpha\rho=\alpha\dot{\rho}, & \delta_\alpha\bar{\rho}=\alpha\dot{\bar{\rho}}, & \delta_\alpha e=(\alpha e)^{\cdot}, \\ \delta_\alpha\psi=(\alpha\psi)^{\cdot}, & \delta_\alpha\bar{\psi}=(\alpha\bar{\psi})^{\cdot}; & \end{array} \tag{3.a}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \delta_\kappa\theta=\frac{1}{e}\Pi_n\sigma^n\bar{\kappa}, \qquad \delta_\kappa\bar{\theta}=\frac{1}{e}\Pi_n\kappa\sigma^n, \\ \delta_\kappa x^n=i\theta\sigma^n\delta\bar{\theta}-i\delta\theta\sigma^n\bar{\theta}-i\kappa\sigma^n\bar{\rho}+i\rho\sigma^n\bar{\kappa}, \\ \delta_\kappa e=4i\dot{\theta}\kappa-4i\bar{\kappa}\dot{\bar{\theta}}, \qquad \delta_\kappa\psi=\dot{\kappa}, \\ \delta_\kappa\bar{\psi}=\dot{\bar{\kappa}}. \end{array} \tag{3.b}$$

As is seen from Eqs. (2) and (3), the coordinates $(x^m,\theta^\alpha,\bar{\theta}_{\dot{\alpha}})$ parametrize the standard $R^{4/4}$ superspace, while the variables e and $(\psi^\alpha,\bar{\psi}_{\dot{\alpha}})$ prove to be the gauge fields for the local α- and κ-symmetries respectively. The role of the pair $(\rho^\alpha,\bar{\rho}_{\dot{\alpha}})$ is to provide the terms corresponding to (mixed) covariant propagator for fermions in the action (1) [23].

---

to be equivalent to the Brink–Schwarz model. As the new formulations involve first class constraints only, the second class constraints problem intrinsic in the Brink–Schwarz theory can be avoided (for works on quantization of the *ABCD* superparticle see Refs. 15 and 18).

Passing to the Hamiltonian formalism one finds primary constraints in the problem

$$\begin{aligned} &p_\theta + ip_n\sigma^n\bar\theta + i\rho = 0, \quad p_\rho = 0, \\ &p_{\bar\theta} + i\theta\sigma^n p_n + i\bar\rho = 0, \quad p_{\bar\rho} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.a}$$

$$p_e = 0, \qquad p_\psi = 0, \qquad p_{\bar\psi} = 0, \tag{4.b}$$

where $(p, p_\theta, p_{\bar\theta}, p_\psi, p_{\bar\psi}, p_\rho, p_{\bar\rho}, p_e)$ are momenta conjugate to the variables $(x, \theta, \bar\theta, \psi, \bar\psi, \rho, \bar\rho, e)$ respectively. The total Hamiltonian has the form

$$\begin{aligned} H = {} & p_e\lambda_e + p_\psi\lambda_\psi - \lambda_{\bar\psi}p_{\bar\psi} + p_\rho\lambda_\rho - \lambda_{\bar\rho}p_{\bar\rho} + \\ & + (p_{\bar\theta} + i\theta\sigma^n p_n + i\bar\rho)\lambda_{\bar\theta} - \lambda_\theta(p_\theta + ip_n\sigma^n\bar\theta + i\rho) + \\ & + e\frac{p^2}{2} - i\psi\sigma^n p_n\bar\rho + i\rho\sigma_n p^n\bar\psi, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $\lambda_{\dots}$ are Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the primary constraints. The consistency conditions for the primary constraints imply the secondary ones

$$p^2 = 0, \qquad p_n\sigma^n\bar\rho = 0, \qquad \rho\sigma^n p_n = 0, \tag{6}$$

and determine some of the Lagrange multipliers,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_\theta = p_n\sigma^n\bar\psi, && \lambda_{\bar\theta} = \psi\sigma^n p_n, \\ &\lambda_\rho = -2p_n\sigma^n\lambda_{\bar\theta} \approx 0, && \lambda_{\bar\rho} = -2\lambda_\theta\sigma^n p_n \approx 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

No tertiary constraints arise from the Dirac procedure and the remaining Lagrange multipliers stay undetermined. Thus, the complete constraint set of the model is given by Eqs. (4),(6) and it is convenient to rewrite the latter in the equivalent form

$$p^2 = 0, \qquad p_m\tilde\sigma^m p_\theta = 0, \qquad p_{\bar\theta}\tilde\sigma^m p_m = 0. \tag{8}$$

The constraints (4.a) are second-class which means that the pairs (ρ, p_ρ), $(\bar\rho, p_{\bar\rho})$ can be omitted after introducing the corresponding Dirac bracket[2] (the Dirac brackets for the remaining variables Γ^i prove to coincide with the Poisson ones $\{\Gamma^i, \Gamma^j\}_D = \{\Gamma^i, \Gamma^j\}$). The first-class constraints (4.b) admit the covariant gauge

$$e = 1, \qquad \psi = 0, \qquad \bar\psi = 0, \tag{9}$$

which implies

$$\lambda_e = 0, \qquad \lambda_\psi = 0, \qquad \lambda_{\bar\psi} = 0, \tag{10}$$

---

[2] We define the fundamental Poisson brackets as $\{x^m, p_n\} = \delta^m{}_n$, $\{\theta^\alpha, p_{\theta\beta}\} = \delta^\alpha{}_\beta$, $\{\bar\theta^{\dot\alpha}, p_{\bar\theta\dot\beta}\} = \delta^{\dot\alpha}{}_{\dot\beta}$.

and allows one to eliminate the variables (e, p_e), (ψ, p_ψ), $(\bar\psi, p_{\bar\psi})$ from the consideration. Thus, after partial phase space reduction, there remain (x, p), (θ, p_θ), $(\bar\theta, p_{\bar\theta})$ variables in the problem which are subject to the first-class constraints (8). The total Hamiltonian vanishes on the constraint surface in full agreement with the reparametrization invariance of the model.

Some remarks are relevant here. First, from Eq. (8) it follows

$$p_\theta^2 = 0, \qquad p_{\bar\theta}^2 = 0. \tag{11}$$

This means that the C-constraint of the $10d$ $ABCD$ superparticle [16] (which removes negative norm states from the quantum spectrum [15-17]) automatically holds in four dimensions. Second, the constraints (8) just coincide with the first-class ones of the $4d$ Brink–Schwarz superparticle [15]. It is infinitely reducible constraint set which requires an infinite tower of ghost variables in BFV quantization [12, 15]. Third, a covariant gauge to Eq. (8) is known to be problematic in the original phase space [10] (the conventional noncovariant gauge choice is $x^+ = \tau p^+$, $\theta\sigma^+ = 0$, $\sigma^+\bar\theta = 0$). We refrain from fixing the gauge freedom related to the first-class constraints (8) and will treat them as restrictions on physical states in the course of Dirac quantization. This gives us a possibility to develop a covariant scheme of quantization which is presented below.

3. Since Dirac brackets for the independent variables coincide with the Poisson ones, the commutation relations for the corresponding operators are canonical. We can realize them in the coordinate representation,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{x}^n = x^n, && \hat{p}_m = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^m}, && [\hat{x}^n, \hat{p}_m] = i\delta^n{}_m, \\
&\hat{\theta}^\alpha = \theta^\alpha, && \hat{p}_{\theta_\alpha} = i\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\alpha}, && [\hat{\theta}^\alpha, \hat{p}_{\theta_\beta}] = i\delta^\alpha{}_\beta, \\
&\hat{\bar\theta}^{\dot\alpha} = \bar\theta^{\dot\alpha}, && \hat{p}_{\bar\theta_{\dot\alpha}} = i\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar\theta^{\dot\alpha}}, && [\hat{\bar\theta}^{\dot\alpha}, \hat{p}_{\bar\theta_{\dot\beta}}] = i\delta^{\dot\alpha}{}_{\dot\beta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

on a Hilbert space whose elements are chosen to be real scalar superfields (they do not depend on time since the Hamiltonian vanishes on the constraint surface)

$$\begin{aligned}
V(x, \theta, \bar\theta) = {} & A(x) + \theta\psi(x) + \bar\theta\bar\psi(x) + \theta^2 F(x) + \bar\theta^2 \bar F(x) + \\
& + \theta\sigma^n\bar\theta C_n(x) + \bar\theta^2\theta\lambda(x) + \theta^2\bar\theta\bar\lambda(x) + \theta^2\bar\theta^2 D(x),
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

and which obey the boundary condition

$$V(x, \theta, \bar\theta) \underset{x \to \pm\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0\ . \tag{14}$$

The physical states in the Hilbert space are defined in the usual way [24,25]

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{p}^2|\text{phys}\rangle = 0, \\ &\tilde{\sigma}^n \hat{p}_n \hat{p}_\theta |\text{phys}\rangle = 0, \\ &\tilde{\sigma}^n \hat{p}_n \hat{p}_{\bar{\theta}} |\text{phys}\rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

In the explicit representation (12), (13) this yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\sigma}^n \partial_n \psi = 0, \qquad \tilde{\sigma}^n \partial_n \bar{\psi} = 0, \\ &\Box A = 0; \end{aligned} \tag{16.a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(\tilde{\sigma}^m \sigma^n)^{\dot{\alpha}}{}_{\dot{\beta}} \partial_m C_n = 0, \qquad (\sigma^n \tilde{\sigma}^m)_\alpha{}^\beta \partial_m C_n = 0, \\ &\Box C_n = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{16.b}$$

with all other component fields vanishing due to the boundary condition (14). In obtaining Eq. (16) the identity

$$\text{Tr}\,(\sigma^n \tilde{\sigma}^m) = -2\eta^{nm} \tag{17}$$

was used.

Consider now Eq.(16.b). Taking a trace of the first equation and making use of Eq. (17) one finds

$$\partial^n C_n = 0, \tag{18}$$

which (with the use of the standard relation $\sigma^n \tilde{\sigma}^m + \sigma^m \tilde{\sigma}^n = -2\eta^{nm}$) allows one to rewrite Eq. (16.b) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} &(\sigma^{mn})_\alpha{}^\beta \partial_m C_n = 0, \qquad (\tilde{\sigma}^{mn})^{\dot{\alpha}}{}_{\dot{\beta}} \partial_m C_n = 0, \\ &\Box C_n = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Multiplying the first equality in Eq. (19) with $(\sigma^{kl})_\beta{}^\alpha$, and taking into account the identity

$$\text{Tr}\,\sigma^{mn}\sigma^{kl} = -\frac{1}{2}(\eta^{mk}\eta^{nl} - \eta^{ml}\eta^{nk}) - \frac{i}{2}\epsilon^{mnkl}, \tag{20}$$

one gets

$$\partial_k C_l - \partial_l C_k = -i\epsilon_{klmn}\partial^m C^n, \tag{21}$$

which together with its complex conjugate implies

$$\partial_m C_n - \partial_n C_m = 0, \qquad \epsilon_{klmn}\partial^m C^n = 0. \tag{22}$$

The only solution to Eqs. (18), (22) is

$$C_n = \partial_n B, \tag{23}$$

with B the on-shell massless scalar field

$$\Box B = 0. \tag{24}$$

Thus, physical states of the first quantized Siegel superparticle look like

$$V_{\text{phys}}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = A(x) + \theta\psi(x) + \bar{\theta}\bar{\psi}(x) + \theta\sigma^n\bar{\theta}\partial_n B(x), \tag{25}$$

with A, B the on-shell massless real scalar fields (irreps of the Poincaré group of helicity 0) and $\psi, \bar{\psi}$ the on-shell massless spinor fields (helicities 1/2 and –1/2, respectively). Note that together they fit to form two irreducible representations of the super Poincaré group of superhelicities 0 and –1/2 [26].

It is worth mentioning that Eq. (15) can be rewritten in the manifestly superinvariant form

$$\tilde{\sigma}^{n\dot{\alpha}\alpha}\partial_n D_\alpha V = 0, \qquad \tilde{\sigma}^{n\dot{\alpha}\alpha}\partial_n \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} V = 0, \tag{26}$$

where D_α, $\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}$ are the covariant derivatives, or as the single massless Dirac equation

$$\gamma^n\partial_n\Psi = 0, \tag{27}$$

with $\Psi \equiv \begin{pmatrix} D_\alpha V \\ \bar{D}^{\dot{\alpha}} V \end{pmatrix}$ a Majorana (superfield) spinor.

An effective field theory which reproduces equations (16.a), (24) is easy to write

$$S = \int d^4x\{\frac{1}{2}\partial^m A\partial_m A + \frac{1}{2}\partial^m B\partial_m B + i\psi\sigma^m\partial_m\bar{\psi}\}, \tag{28}$$

which is invariant under the global (on-shell) supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{array}{l} \delta A = \epsilon\psi + \bar{\epsilon}\bar{\psi}, \qquad \delta B = i\epsilon\psi - i\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\psi}, \\ \delta\psi = i(\sigma^n\bar{\epsilon})\partial_n A + (\sigma^n\bar{\epsilon})\partial_n B, \\ \delta\bar{\psi} = -i(\epsilon\sigma^n)\partial_n A + (\epsilon\sigma^n)\partial_n B. \end{array} \tag{29}$$

In Eq. (28) we recognize the massless Wess–Zumino model in the component form [20].

Thus, we have demonstrated that first quantization of the Siegel superparticle leads to the massless Wess-Zumino theory.

4. As is known, the superfield formulation of the massless Wess–Zumino model involves chiral and antichiral superfields [20, 22],

$$S = \int d^8z\, \Phi\bar{\Phi}, \tag{30.a}$$

$$\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\Phi = 0, \tag{30.b}$$

$$D_{\alpha}\bar{\Phi} = 0. \tag{30.c}$$

Equations of motion for the theory (30) read

$$D^2\Phi = 0, \tag{31.a}$$

$$\bar{D}^2\bar{\Phi} = 0. \tag{31.b}$$

Let us show that the real scalar superfield (13) satisfying the constraints (26) is the sum of on-shell massless chiral ((30.b), (31.a)) and antichiral ((30.c), (31.b)) superfields.

Consider Eqs. (30.b), (31.a). The first of them implies the decomposition [22, 26]

$$\Phi(x,\theta,\bar{\theta}) = \alpha(x) + \theta\psi(x) + \theta^2 f(x) + i\theta\sigma^n\bar{\theta}\partial_n\alpha(x) + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2\bar{\theta}\tilde{\sigma}^n\partial_n\psi + \frac{1}{4}\theta^2\bar{\theta}^2\Box\alpha, \tag{32}$$

while the latter, being rewritten in the equivalent form

$$\tilde{\sigma}^{n\,\dot{\alpha}\alpha}\partial_n D_\alpha\Phi = 0, \tag{33}$$

yields

$$\tilde{\sigma}^n\partial_n\psi = 0, \qquad \Box\alpha = 0, \qquad f = 0. \tag{34}$$

To get Eqs. (33), (34) we used the identity

$$[D^2, \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}] = -4i\sigma^n{}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\partial_n D^\alpha, \tag{35}$$

and assumed the standard boundary conditions. Note also that the chirality condition together with Eq. (33) implies

$$\Box\Phi = 0, \tag{36}$$

as a consequence of

$$\{D_\alpha, \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\} = -2i\sigma^n{}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\partial_n. \tag{37}$$

Thus, an on-shell scalar chiral superfield can be written as

$$\begin{gathered}\Phi(x,\theta,\bar{\theta}) = \alpha(x) + \theta\psi(x) + i\theta\sigma^n\bar{\theta}\partial_n\alpha(x), \\ \Box\alpha(x) = 0, \qquad \tilde{\sigma}^n\partial_n\psi(x) = 0.\end{gathered} \tag{38}$$

Similarly, an on-shell scalar antichiral superfield ((30.c), (31.b)) reads

$$\begin{gathered}\bar{\Phi}(x,\theta,\bar{\theta}) = \bar{\alpha}(x) + \bar{\theta}\bar{\psi}(x) - i\theta\sigma^n\bar{\theta}\partial_n\bar{\alpha}(x), \\ \Box\bar{\alpha}(x) = 0, \qquad \tilde{\sigma}^n\partial_n\bar{\psi}(x) = 0.\end{gathered} \tag{39}$$

Considering now the sum

$$\Phi + \bar{\Phi} = (\alpha + \bar{\alpha}) + \theta\psi + \bar{\theta}\bar{\psi} + \theta\sigma^n\bar{\theta}\partial_n i(\alpha - \bar{\alpha}), \tag{40}$$

and denoting

$$\alpha + \bar{\alpha} = A, \qquad i(\alpha - \bar{\alpha}) = B, \tag{41}$$

one arrives just at Eq. (25). Thus, the real scalar superfield subject to the constraints (26) was proven to be the sum of on-shell chiral and antichiral superfields

$$V_{\text{phys}}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = \Phi(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) + \bar{\Phi}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}). \tag{42}$$

As is known, on-shell massless scalar chiral superfields form massless irreducible representation of the super Poincaré group of superhelicity 0 [26]. Analogously, on-shell massless scalar antichiral superfields realize irrep of superhelicity $-1/2$. We may conclude here that quantum states of the first quantized Siegel superparticle form a reducible representation of the super Poincaré group which contains superhelicities 0 and $-1/2$.

Thus, in this letter we have considered canonical quantization of the Siegel superparticle in $R^{4/4}$ superspace.. Quantum states of the model were proven to be the sum of on-shell chiral and antichiral superfields. The corresponding effective field theory was shown to be the massless Wess–Zumino model. Because propagators of the theory are well known, it seems interesting to reproduce Siegel's action within the framework of the proper-time approach [27], as well as, to compare the result with that of the straightforward BFV quantization combined with the scheme [19]. This work is in progress now.

As was mentioned above, the C-constraint of the $10d$ $ABCD$-superparticle [16] is not necessary in four dimensions. It is tempting to extend the model (1) up to a theory equivalent to the $4d$ Brink–Schwarz superparticle along the lines of Ref. 16. Since constraints quadratic in fermions will no appear now, we expect considerable simplification in the corresponding BFV quantization.

Due to the relation to superstring theory, the $10d$ case is of prime interest. The operatorial quantization presented in this work is rather specific in four dimensions. We hope, however, that BFV path integral quantization will proceed along the same lines both in $4d$ and $10d$. The results on this subject will be present elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

A.A.D. thanks the Institute for Theoretical Physics of Hannover University for hospitality.The work of A.A.D has been supported in part by the Joint DFG–RFBR project No 96–02–00180G. A.V.G. thanks the ICTP for the hospitality at the early stage of this work. D.M.G. thanks Brasilian foundation CNPq for permanent support.

References

[1] F.A. Berezin and M.S. Marinov, JETP Lett. **21** (1975) 320; Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **104** (1977) 336.

[2] L. Brink, S. Deser, B. Zumino, P. Di Vecchia, and P. Howe, Phys. Lett. B **64** (1976) 435; L. Brink, P. Di Vecchia, and P. Howe, Nucl. Phys. B **118** (1977) 76; R. Casalbuoni, Nuovo Cimento A **33** (1976) 115; A. Barducci, R. Casalbuoni, and L. Lusanna, Nuovo Cimento A **35** (1976) 377; M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **143** (1982) 127; D.M. Gitman and I.V. Tyutin, Class. Quantum Grav. **7** (1990) 2131; D.M. Gitman, in: *Topics in Statistical and Theoretical Physics*, F.A. Berezin Memorial vol. Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2) 177 (1996) 83.

[3] P.P. Srivastava, Nuovo Cimento Lett. **19** (1977) 239; V.D. Gershun and V.I. Tkach, Pis'ma Zh. Eksper. Teor. Fiz. **29** (1979) 320; D.M. Gitman, A.E. Goncalves, and I.V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **10** (1995) 701.

[4] D.M. Gitman and I.V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **12** (1997) 535.

[5] D.M. Gitman and I.V. Tyutin, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **11** (1996) 381.

[6] D.M. Gitman, A.E. Goncalves, and I.V. Tyutin, Phys. Rev. D **50** (1994) 5439; D.M. Gitman and A.E. Goncalves, J. Math. Phys. **38** (1997) 2167; G. Grigorian, R. Grigorian, and I.V. Tyutin, Teor. Mat. Fiz. **111** (1997) 389.

[7] E.S. Fradkin and D.M. Gitman, Phys. Rev. D. **44** (1991) 3230; D.M. Gitman. and A.V. Saa, Class. Quantum Grav. **10** (1993) 1447.

[8] J.W. van Holten, Nucl. Phys. B **457** (1995) 375.

[9] D.M. Gitman, Nucl. Phys. B **488** (1997) 490;

[10] L. Brink, M. Henneaux, and C. Teitelboim, Nucl. Phys. B **293** (1987) 505; C.M. Hull and J.L. Vázquez-Bello, Nucl. Phys. B **416** (1994) 173.

[11] L. Brink and J.H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B **100** (1981) 310.

[12] E.A. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh, and A. Van Proeyen, Phys. Lett. B **251** (1990) 128.

[13] Y. Eisenberg and S. Solomon, Nucl. Phys. B **309** (1988) 709; F. Delduc, A. Galperin, and E. Sokatchev, Nucl. Phys. B **368** (1992) 143; D.P. Sorokin, V.I. Tkach, and D.V. Volkov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **4** (1989) 901.

[14] W. Siegel, Class. Quant. Grav. **2** (1985) L 95.

[15] F. Ebler, M. Hatsuda, E. Laenen, W. Siegel, J.P. Yamron, T. Kimura, and A. Mikovič, Nucl. Phys. B **364** (1991) 67.

[16] W. Siegel, Nucl. Phys. B **263** (1986) 93; Phys. Lett. B **203** (1988) 79.

[17] A.R. Mikovič and W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. B **209** (1988) 47.

[18] M.B. Green and C.M. Hull, Nucl. Phys. B **344** (1990) 115.

[19] A.A. Deriglazov and A.V. Galajinsky, Phys. Lett. B **381** (1996) 105; Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 5195.

[20] J. Wess and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. B **70** (1974) 139.

[21] A.A. Deriglazov and A.V. Galajinsky, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **9** (1994) 3445.

[22] J. Wess and J. Bagger *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, 2d ed. (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1992).

[23] S.J. Gates Jr., H. Nishino, and R.N. Oerter, Phys. Lett. B **265** (1991) 278.

[24] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, Yeshiva University, Belfer Graduate School of Science (Academic Press, New York, 1964).

[25] D.M. Gitman and I.V. Tyutin, *Quantization of Fields with Constraints* (Springer-Verlag, 1990).

[26] I.L. Buchbinder and S.M. Kuzenko, *Ideas and Methods of Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, (Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol and Philadelphia, 1995).

[27] E.S. Fradkin and Sh.M. Shvartsman, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **6** (1991) 1977